

Simulations of deposition growth models in various dimensions. Are overhangs important?

David Y.K. Ko and Flavio Seno

Department of Physics, University of Oxford, 1 Keble Road, Oxford, OX1 3NP, U.K.

We present simulation results of deposition growth of surfaces in 2, 3 and 4 dimensions for ballistic deposition where overhangs are present, and for restricted solid on solid deposition where there are no overhangs. The values of the scaling exponents for the two models are found to be different, suggesting that they belong to different universality classes.

PACS numbers: 68.55.Jk, 05.70.Ln, 61.50.Cj, Cd, 64.60.Ht

The deposition growth of surfaces [1] has been a subject of long continual theoretical and experimental interest [2] due to its relevance to non-equilibrium processes in general as well as its possible role in surface technology. The profile of the deposited surface gradually roughens under the stochastic accumulation of particles, and early simulations by Family *et. al.* [3] suggested that the surface roughness exhibits a dynamical scaling behaviour. That is, the height-height correlation function, $G(r - r', t) = \langle [h(r, t) - h(r', t)]^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$, scales with time, t , and separation, $\ell = |r - r'|$, as

$$G(\ell, t) \sim \ell^\alpha f(t/\ell^z). \quad (1)$$

$h(r, t)$ is the height of the surface at position r and at time t . The dynamical scaling behaviour is characterised by the roughness exponent, α , and the dynamical exponent, β , with $z = \alpha/\beta$. The scaling function $f(x)$ behaves as $f(x) = x^\beta$ for $x \ll 1$ and $f(x) = \text{constant}$ for $x \gg 1$. Thus, the surface roughness grows as $G(t) \sim t^\beta$ initially, independent of size, and for a given size, ℓ , the roughness saturates after a sufficiently long time such that $G(\ell)$ scales with ℓ only as $G(\ell) \sim \ell^\alpha$.

Numerous simulations in a variety of growth models [4,5,6,7] have since confirmed the hypothesis of dynamical scaling, including models which allow overhangs to form and models where overhangs are not allowed. An overhang is formed when a particle sticks at a position higher than the height of the surface at that point, such the space below the particle is not filled. Simulations of the restricted solid on solid model [10,11] where incoming particles fall directly onto the surface such that no overhangs can form, and may only stick at a site if the resulting nearest neighbour height differences are less than some predetermined value, have led to a further consensus that the values of the scaling corresponds to that of the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation [12],

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = \nu \nabla^2 h + \frac{\lambda}{2} (\nabla h)^2 + \eta,$$

where η is a random variable. This equation is believed to be a continuum description of deposition growth, and

was derived by assuming that the surface grows uniformly in the direction of the local normal. The exponents obtained are exact in 2 dimensions [12], and numerically determined in higher dimensions [8,9].

Results from simulations of the ballistic deposition model [13] where incoming particles stick at the first point of contact and thus allow overhangs are more controversial. At present there is no clear consensus as to whether or not this system belongs to the same universality class as that described by the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation [14], or whether the presence of overhangs leads to a different set of scaling exponents. Early results by Meakin *et. al.* gave $\alpha = 0.47$ and $\beta = 0.331$ in 2 dimensions, and $\alpha = 0.33$ and $\beta = 0.24$ in 3 dimensions, in agreement with Kim and Kosterlitz's approximate formula [5] of $\alpha = 2/(d+2)$ and $\beta = 1/(d+1)$ for the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation. More recent results suggest that the values of the scaling exponents may, in fact, be different. Baiod *et. al.* [15] obtained $\beta = 1/3$ in 2 dimensions and $\alpha = 0.3$ and $\beta = 0.22$ in 3 dimensions; off-lattice simulations have also given $\beta = 0.343$ in 2 dimensions [16], but a clear scaling behaviour was not observed in 3 dimensions [17].

In this Letter, we report results of simulations of ballistic deposition and restricted solid on solid growth. We find that the values of the scaling exponents for the ballistic deposition model are different to those of the restricted solid on solid model. A summary of our results is given in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Scaling exponents obtained from our simulations.

dimension d	Ballistic deposition			Restricted solid on solid		
	α	β	z	α	β	z
2	0.45	0.32	1.40	0.50	0.33	1.50
3	0.26	0.21	1.24	0.40	0.25	1.60
4	~ 0.12	—	—	0.29	0.18	1.61

FIG. 1. Ballistic deposition for 2 dimensions. The inset shows the plot of $\ln G(\ell, t)$ versus $\log_2 \ell$ at the end of the simulation.

We also find that while on-lattice simulations give excellent scaling behaviour for the restricted solid on solid model, the same is not true for ballistic deposition. Quasi off-lattice simulations were therefore carried out for the ballistic deposition model. Namely, each axis of a surface of size L^{d-1} particle diameters is divided into nL points such that incoming particles can be centred on any one of these points. For n large, the surface approaches a continuum, and for $n = 1$, we recover the on-lattice model. The height of the surface at a position r is defined to be the height of a new particle if it fell onto the surface at r . We found that $n = 3$ is sufficient to give a good scaling behaviour, and no differences were found in the results with $n = 5, 7$ and 10 . We performed simulations in 2, 3 and 4 dimensions for both models and the simulations are run until the equivalent of at least 2000 layers of atoms have been deposited. The total number of particles deposited in each simulation is over 2×10^9 . The minimum time required for each run is twenty-four CPU hours on a DEC Alpha 400 workstation. To obtain good statistics, averages over many runs were often needed.

In figure 1, the correlation function, $G(\ell, t)$, for a 2 dimensional ballistic deposition simulation is plotted versus time in a log-log plot. The largest system size considered is $\ell = 2^{20}$. For the larger values of ℓ , the roughness has not saturated within the time scale of the simulation. In the dynamical scaling region, we see a clear power law behaviour, $G(t) \sim t^\beta$. Also shown in the inset is a plot of $\ln G(\ell, t)$ versus $\log_2 \ell$ for the data at the end of our simulation. For the smaller sizes where saturation has been reached, we also find a roughly linear dependence of $\ln G$ on $\log_2 \ell$ in agreement with the predictions of dynamical scaling.

Direct extrapolation of the scaling exponents from the gradients in the log-log plots turned out to be difficult because cross-over effects due to the transition from the dynamical scaling regime to the saturated scaling regime

introduce significant corrections. Instead, by rewriting equation (1) as

$$\ln G(\ell, t) - \beta \ln t = F(\alpha \ln \ell - \beta \ln t), \quad (2)$$

we can obtain good estimates of the dynamical and roughness exponents by collapsing our data for all sizes and all times considered. This, in fact, provides a way of checking also whether the data corresponds to just one scaling regime, or whether there is also a cross-over between different universality classes with different scaling exponents. We note that the surface roughness during the initial few time steps is strongly influenced by transient effects, and have been discarded in the data collapse.

The collapsed data for the 2 dimensional ballistic deposition result is shown in figure 2. Data for ℓ ranging from 2^2 to 2^{19} are used in the plot, with over 6×10^9 particles deposited. The values of the exponents used are $\alpha = 0.45$ and $\beta = 0.32$. We have also carried out simulations of the restricted solid on solid model in 2 dimensions, and found that $\alpha = 0.50$ and $\beta = 0.33$, in agreement with the results of previous simulations.

FIG. 2. Collapsed data for 2 dimensional ballistic deposition simulation, with $\alpha = 0.45$ and $\beta = 0.32$. The data used ranges from $\ell = 2^2$ to 2^{19} . The inset shows the collapse obtained with the exponents obtained for the restricted solid on solid model.

The collapsed data for the 3 dimensional simulations are shown in figure 3. The upper diagram is for the restricted solid on solid model. The size of the system considered is $2^{10} \times 2^{10}$, and over 2×10^9 particles were deposited in a run. The data presented represents the average over seven independent runs, and include values for ℓ ranging from 2^2 to 2^9 . The values of the scaling exponents obtained in this case are $\alpha = 0.40$ and $\beta = 0.25$. This is in agreement with the approximate formula of Kim and Kosterlitz [5], but the value of β obtained is greater by 0.01 than that observed more recently by Ala-Nissila *et al.* [11].

Ballistic deposition simulations in 3 dimensions are also carried out for systems with size equal to $2^{10} \times 2^{10}$ particle diameters, with three subdivisions per particle diameter. The collapsed data are shown in the lower diagram of figure 3. Again, over 2×10^9 particles were deposited per run, and the results presented represent the average over ten runs with data for $\ell = 2^2$ to 2^9 used in the data collapse. The simulations were also carried out with seven subdivisions per particle diameter and no difference was found. The value of the scaling exponents in this case are $\alpha = 0.26$ and $\beta = 0.21$, significantly lower than the corresponding values for the restricted solid on solid model.

FIG. 3. Collapsed data for the 3 dimensional restricted solid on solid simulation (upper diagram), and the ballistic deposition simulation (lower diagram) for $\ell = 2^2$ to 2^9 . The inset in the lower diagram shows the collapse obtained if the exponents obtained from the restricted solid on solid model were used instead.

We have also carried out simulations in higher dimensions for both models. However, due to computational difficulties, we are restricted to relatively small sizes. For the ballistic deposition model the largest size possible in 4 dimensions or higher is still too small for the dynamical scaling regime to be observed. Estimates of

the roughness exponent in 4 dimensions, however, give a value of $\alpha \approx 0.12$. The uncertainty in this case is due to strong fluctuations in the roughness as a result of the small system size, and the number of runs required to obtain better statistics is prohibitively large. For the restricted solid on solid model, the fluctuations are smaller even in 4 dimensions and we have been able to obtain reliable values for both the dynamical and the roughness exponents. These are $\alpha = 0.29$ and $\beta = 0.18$, in good agreement with those obtained by Ala-Nissila *et. al.* [11]. Again, in accordance with the trend observed in lower dimensions, the exponent of the ballistic deposition model is lower than that of the restricted solid on solid model.

FIG. 4. A cross-section of ballistic deposition growth in 3 dimensions taken at a height of 200 particle diameters. The length of the horizontal and vertical axis correspond to 100 particle diameters.

We have found that variations in the value of either α or β by as little as 0.01 is sufficient to give clear deterioration of the data collapse plots. The values we present are therefore accurate to the figures quoted. The most important implication of this is that from our results, the dynamical scaling behaviour of the ballistic deposition model and the restricted solid on solid model belong to different universality classes. We have shown in the inset to figures 2 and 3 what happens when we try to collapse the ballistic deposition data with the exponents obtained from the corresponding restricted solid on solid simulations. It is clear from the diagrams that even in 2 dimensions where the differences between the values of the scaling exponents for the ballistic deposition model and those of the restricted solid on solid model are apparently small, a satisfactory data collapse cannot be obtained. In view of the belief that the dynamics of the restricted solid on solid model corresponds to that of the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation, our results would therefore further suggest that the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang is not appropriate in describing deposition growth in situations where overhangs are dominant. Indeed, our values of the scaling exponents for the ballistic deposition model in 2,

3 and in 4 dimensions lie outside the range of the values for the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang exponents [12,8,9].

FIG. 5. The fraction x of sites occupied along a substrate dimension versus the substrate dimension.

We have also tried to examine the structure of the solid formed by growth under ballistic deposition conditions. Figure 4 show a cross-section of the bulk formed in a 3 dimensional ballistic deposition simulations. The cross-section corresponds to a height of 200 particle diameters from the substrate, and is taken after all the particles at this height are covered. The cross section shown corresponds to an area of 100×100 particle diameters. We find that there are very few connected lines, and no connected rings in the cross section. In addition, we have calculated the fraction of sites, x , which are occupied in a linear direction from the average density, ρ . For a d_s dimensional surface, the density is given by $\rho = x^{d_s}$. In figure 5 a plot of x versus substrate dimension is shown. The results indicate that of order 0.4 of the sites along a line on the surface are occupied in all dimensions. This, together with the cross section plot, corroborates with the idea that particles grow on the edges of overhangs, and almost immediately branch off to form a complex tree like structure.

In summary, we have found that the presence of overhangs is an important factor in determining the scaling properties of deposition growth. In a model such as ballistic deposition, overhangs will form when the local surface gradient exceeds a critical value corresponding to the presence of a sharp step in the surface profile. In such a situation, the next particle will stick to increase the lateral size of the overhang region rather than to reduce the surface gradient by falling to the lower surface. Thus, as overhangs begin to form, they will tend to increase the lateral correlation at a fast rate, and the surface will no longer grow in the direction of its local gradient. The result may be an anisotropic growth which when coarse grained lead to broader and flatter structures. Although such a picture can give a behaviour consistent with the results of our simulations, the search for a proper the-

ory for deposition growth in the presence of overhangs remain an important challenge.

We thank H. Aoki, B.K. Chakrabarti, R.A. Cowley, K. Inata, A. Maritan, A.L. Stella for useful discussions. F.S. acknowledges the European Community for a post-doctoral fellowship under the Human Capital and Mobility Programme. This was carried out under grant GR/G02727 of the Science and Engineering Research Council of the United Kingdom.

-
- [1] *Dynamics of Fractal Surfaces*, edited by F. Family and T. Vicsek, World Scientific, Singapore (1991); C. Godrèche (ed), *Solids far from equilibrium*, proceedings of the Beg-Rohu Summer School (1989), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1991).
 - [2] *See for example*: J. Chevrier, V. le Thanh, R. Buys and J. Darrien, Europhys. Lett. **16**, 732 (1991); Y.L. He, H.N. Yang, T.M. Lu and G.C. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3770 (1992); M.A. Cotta, R.A. Hamm, T.W. Statley, S.N.G. Chu, L.R. Harriot, M.B. Panish and H. Temkin, Phys. Rev. Lett **70**, 4106 (1993).
 - [3] F. Family and T. Vicsek, J. Phys. **A18**, L75 (1985).
 - [4] P. Meakin, P. Ramanlal, L. M. Sander and R.C. Ball, Phys. Rev **A34**, 5091 (1986).
 - [5] J.M. Kim and J.M. Kosterlitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2289 (1989)
 - [6] F. Family, Physica **A168**, 561 (1990).
 - [7] C. Tang and S. Liang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2769 (1993).
 - [8] J. G. Amar and F. Family, Phys. Rev. **A41**, 3399 (1990).
 - [9] K. Moser, J. Kertész and D.E. Wolf, Physica A **178**, 215 (1991).
 - [10] B.M. Forrest and L.H. Tang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 1405 (1990).
 - [11] T. Ala-Nissila, T. Hjelt, J.M. Kosterlitz and O. Venäläinen, J. Stat. Phys. **72**, 207 (1993).
 - [12] M. Kardar, G. Parisi and Y.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 889 (1986).
 - [13] M.J. Vold, J. Colloid. Interface Sci. **14**, 168 (1959) and M.J. Vold, J. Chem. Phys. **63**, 1608 (1960).
 - [14] A. Maritan, F. Toigo, J. Koplik and J.R. Banavar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3193 (1992).
 - [15] R. Baiod, D. Kessler, P. Rammanal, L. Sander and R. Savit, Phys. Rev. **A38**, 3672 (1988).
 - [16] P. Meakin and R. Jullien, J. Physique **48**, 1651 (1987).
 - [17] R. Jullien and P. Meakin, Europhys. Lett. **4**, 1385 (1987).